

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 23 are pending in this application, of which claim 23 is newly-added.

Claims 9-22 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by **Okada et al.**

(previously applied).

As Applicants noted in their previous response of July 23, 2003:

Contrary to what the Examiner has asserted, **Okada et al.** discloses that the MSSW will be excited if an RF signal is inputted into input transducer 38a, and “it spreads receiving saturation limiting, and is received by output transducer 38b.” Thus, in **Okada et al.**, the magnetostatic wave propagates between the input and output transducers, in contrast to the present invention, in which the wave propagates between first and second end surfaces in the magnetic layer, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Therefore, **Okada et al.** fails to also disclose the first and second intervals for propagation, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

The Examiner has disagreed with this argument, urging:

Applicant's arguments are not convincing since the input and output transducers are between 1st and 2nd end surfaces, thus the magnetostatic wave does indeed propagate between the end surfaces since the input and output are also between the 1st and 2nd end surfaces.

The Examiner is incorrect. Elements 18, 18 located outside of each transducer 38a, 38b do not permit propagation of the MSSW to the first and second end surfaces because elements 18, 18 function as magnetostatic wave absorption means for “absorbing an unnecessary magnetostatic wave” formed in both ends of the longitudinal direction of the YIG thin film 15, as disclosed in paragraph [0018] of the English translation of **Okada et al.**

In Okada et al., because an unnecessary magnetostatic wave is absorbed by the magnetostatic wave absorption means 18, the magnetostatic wave propagates only in one direction from the input transducer 38a to the output transducer 38b in the magnetic layer, and the magnetostatic wave does not reflect at the end surfaces.

In contrast, the magnetostatic wave device according to claim 1 of the instant application has a construction which produces a magnetostatic wave having a wavelength twice each of the intervals is selectively reflected between the end surfaces of the magnetic layer, as disclosed in page 12, lines 14 to 20 of the specification. This achieves the effect of enlarging the range of wavelengths of selectively reflectable magnetostatic waves so that the passband of the magnetostatic wave device can be enlarged without increasing insertion loss.

Claim 23 has been added which specifically recites this feature, which results from the construction recited in claim 1.

Thus, the 35 USC §102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.


In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-8 and 23, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla

Atty. Docket No. **011548**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

HEHOME\letitia\WLB\01\011548\amendment jan 2004

RECEIVED
JAN 22 2004
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800